

REMARKS

Claims 8-20 were pending in the application. No claims have been amended, added, or cancelled. Therefore, claims 8-20 remain pending and are being resubmitted for consideration.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on October 8, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests acknowledgement of the IDS.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 – Stridsberg

Claims 8-13, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,778,524 (“Stridsberg”). The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

A. The Claims

Claims 8 and 20 are independent claims. Claim 8 recites a component placement device that comprises, among other things:

at least one component pick-and-place unit that is configured to:
(a) pick-up a component from the at least one component feeder; and
(b) place the component on the first substrate supported by the elongated transport device; and

at least one substrate support that is configured to support a second substrate, **wherein the at least one substrate support is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located**, and the at least one substrate support has a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction,

wherein the at least one component pick-and-place unit is further configured to: (c) pick-up a component from the at least one component feeder; and **(d) move the component over the elongated transport device to place the component on the second substrate supported by the substrate support.**

Claim 20 recites a component placement device with features similar to those highlighted above, but which differs in other respects. The rejection should be withdrawn at

least because Stridsberg fails to teach or suggest a component placement device that comprises, among other things: (i) “plac[ing] the component on the first substrate supported by the elongated transport device;” (ii) “at least one substrate support [that] is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located;” or (iii) “mov[ing] the component over the elongated transport device to place the component on the second substrate supported by the substrate support” as recited in claim 8, and similarly in claim 20.

B. Stridsberg

Stridsberg discloses a surface mount machine that includes a printed circuit board (PCB) conveyor 59, 60, 61, a fixed x-axis 47 for X-wagons 48, 49 that carry a pick up head 50, 51, and Y-wagons 45, 46 that move on linear bearing sets 41, 42, 43, 44. Feeders are arranged in magazine banks 52, 53, 54 on a side of the PCB conveyor 59, 60, 61. *See* Stridsberg at Fig. 4.

In Stridsberg, a PCB is loaded onto the PCB conveyor 59 and is moved to the first Y-wagon 45. When the PCB is loaded in the Y-wagon 45, the PCB is moved in a y-direction towards the magazine banks 52, 53, 54 along the linear bearing sets 41, 42. When the PCB is loaded in Y-wagon 45, components are mounted onto the PCB via the pick up head 50. After all of the components available via pick up head 50 are mounted, the PCB is moved back to the PCB conveyor 60 so that the PCB continues moving along the conveyor towards the second Y-wagon 46. At the second Y-wagon 46, the PCB is moved in the y-direction along linear bearing set 43, 44 so that components can be mounted on the PCB from pick up head 51. *See* Stridsberg at Figs. 4 and 5.

(i) Stridsberg does not teach placing the component on the first substrate supported by the elongated transport device

According to the Examiner, PCB conveyor 59 corresponds to the “transport device.” However, when the alleged first substrate (PCB 57) is supported by the alleged transport device (conveyor 59), a component is not mounted on the substrate (PCB 57). Components are only mounted on a substrate (PCB 57) when the substrate is supported by one of the Y-

wagons 45, 46 and moved along linear bearings 41-44 towards the magazine banks 52, 53, 54 and the pick up heads 50, 51. *See* Stridsberg at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 1; and col. 5, lines 36-41. Thus, no components are placed on substrates (PCB 57, 58, 59) when the substrates are supported by the alleged transport device (conveyor 59).

(ii) **Stridsberg does not teach that the at least one substrate support is positioned on only one longitudinal side of the transport device that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located**

According to the Examiner, the linear bearings 41-44 or conveyor 59-61 corresponds to the “substrate support.” Assuming for the sake of the argument that the linear bearings 41-44 correspond to the “substrate support,” the alleged substrate support (linear bearings 41-44) is positioned on the same longitudinal side of the alleged transport device (conveyor 59) as the feeders (magazine banks 52-54). As can be seen in Figure 4 of Stridsberg, the feeders (magazine banks 52-54) are positioned adjacent to the alleged substrate support (linear bearings 41-44). *See* Stridsberg at Fig. 4. Thus, the alleged substrate support (linear bearings 41-44) is not positioned on only one longitudinal side of the alleged transport device (conveyor 59) that is opposite from the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is located.

Assuming for the sake of the argument that the conveyor (59-61) corresponds to the “substrate support” as also alleged by the Examiner, then the alleged substrate support (59-61) is not positioned on a longitudinal side of the alleged transport device (conveyor 59) that is opposite the longitudinal side at which the component feeder (magazine banks 52-54) is located. *See* Stridsberg at Fig. 4. No part of the surface mount machine is shown to be positioned on a longitudinal side of the alleged transport device (conveyor 59) that is opposite the longitudinal side at which the component feeder is (magazine banks 52-54) is located. *See* Stridsberg at Fig. 4.

(iii) Stridsberg does not teach moving the component over the elongated transport device to place the component on the second substrate supported by the substrate support

According to the Examiner, conveyor 59 corresponds to the “transport device” and the PCB 58 corresponds to the “second substrate.” *See* Office Action at p. 2. When the pick up head 50, 51 places a component on the alleged second substrate (PCB 58), the component is not moved over the alleged transport device (conveyor 59). Components are only placed on a substrate (PCB 57, 58, 59) when the substrate is supported by the Y-wagons 45, 46 and the substrate is moved to a mounting position along linear bearings 41-44 closer to the feeders (magazine banks 52-54). *See* Stridsberg at Fig. 4 and at col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 1; and col. 5, lines 36-41. Because of this required positioning of the substrate (PCB 57, 58, 59) for component mounting, **no** component is moved over the alleged transport device (conveyor 59).

Therefore, for at least the reasons stated above, the rejection is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 20.

Claims 9-13 and 19 depend from claim 8 and are allowable therewith, for at least the reasons set forth above, without regard to the further patentable subject matter set forth in these dependent claims.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Stridsberg & Munezane

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stridsberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,000,123 (“Munezane”). Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Even assuming for the sake of the argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Stridsberg in view of Munezane in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the resulting modification would still fail to remedy the deficiencies noted above in regard to claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 – Stridsberg & Kanayama

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stridsberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,894,657 (“Kanayama”). Claim 16 depends from claim 8. The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Even assuming for the sake of the argument that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Stridsberg in view of Kanayama in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the resulting modification would still fail to remedy the deficiencies noted above in regard to claim 8. Thus, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

V. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.


Serial No. 10/563,091

Atty. Dkt. No. 095575-0234

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 17, 2010

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4776
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 
Jessica M. Cahill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 56,986